

Bowling Green State University
ScholarWorks@BGSU

Administrative Staff Council

University Publications

2001

Personnel Welfare Committee 1999-2001

Bowling Green State University. Administrative Staff Council

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/asc>

Repository Citation

Bowling Green State University. Administrative Staff Council, "Personnel Welfare Committee 1999-2001" (2001). *Administrative Staff Council*. 200.
<https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/asc/200>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Administrative Staff Council by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

Pre-Microfilm Inventory

Collection: Bowling Green State University
Administrative Staff Council, UA-022

Location: Bowling Green, Ohio

Title of Series: Personnel Welfare Committee

Inclusive Dates: 1999-2001

Format: ☐ Bound ☒ Loose

Order: ☐ Alpha ☒ Chronological ☐ Numerical

Index: ☐ Included ☐ Separate ☒ None

Notes

1. Highlighter

Summary of PWC Activities for 1999-2000

PWC was charged with three significant activities for the year. The first was to write a resolution that would facilitate the distribution of \$160K as outlined in the Administrative Compensation Plan of the 1998-1999 year. There was a need to determine the criteria by which staff members could be brought up to the midpoint. The second was to develop a resolution recommending implementation of Phase I of the Employee Wellness Program during the 2000-2001 fiscal year. The third, and unfinished, activity was to revise the Non-Compensation Conciliation Process that had been approved in May, 1998.

For the \$160K distribution, PWC needed to choose which of three criteria should be used for the 9 year period that staff would need to meet in order to be brought up to the midpoint. One could be just the number of years in position; a second could be number of years as an Administrative employee; and the third could be total years at the University. There were strong reasons why PWC endorsed the second criterion; however, this criterion was not endorsed as the final method of distributing the \$160K. Therefore, by default, PWC supported the decision that only number of years in position should determine the issue. PWC was represented in the HR process both for constructing and executing the Appeals Process that accompanied the \$160K distribution.

PWC developed a resolution for the implementation of Phase I of the Employee Wellness Program during the 2000-2001 fiscal year. Such resolution was passed by ASC on January 6, 2000.

One member of the administrative staff worked through the conciliation process and found it lacking in support for the employee. He petitioned ASC to rewrite the Conciliation Process for Non-Compensation Plan Complaints. HR indicated at the outset that they would not have time to consider the change until July 2000 at the earliest. Accordingly, PWC can hand over the document to next year's ASC Exec Team as a carryover issue for the new PWC. It is hoped that a September and October reading may establish the new document. This can only happen, though, if HR is involved with the process throughout the summer. We understand that Human Resources' approval is needed in order to facilitate change in this document.

To: Laura Emch <lemch@bgnet.bgsu.edu>, ikloppi
From: "Mary E. Zachary" <mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Re: charge for pwc
Cc: jluthma
Bcc:
Attached:

Laura,

Thank for reminding me at the reception today that we need to talk about the PWC stuff. I'm also sending this to Inge since we can do some preliminary work via email. I'm copying Joe Luthman because he definitely has background from PWC last year and may have much of the paper work you need. He's also on PWC this year as an at-large member.

Here's what we've been discussing regarding PWC: (but there is some background about which we'll need to chat)

PWC

- Assist Human Resources (HR) with the 3rd year of the President's Compensation Plan. (HR is not ready to move on this, yet. They are finishing up the Classified salary survey, then they go into the insurance open enrollment period, then they'll start the identification process. Maybe we could do some leg work for them even if they aren't prepared to deal with the information....That's where that "relationship" helps.
- Prepare for a discussion with the administration concerning the imposition Caps. (Since many state supported higher education institutions use compensations plans, how are caps handled at peer/other institutions? Are all constituent groups on the other campus handled in the same way? How/Can we get the institution to recognize the inconsistency of 100% merit and caps? HR may have a different solution. We have eluded the bullet for the past two years, but don't think we can this coming year.) Becca has some thoughts about this that may help, but we won't know if she does until mid academic year.
- Begin Public Relations work to promote a Wellness Program. Prepare for and build a mandate for a wellness program. There will be a survey by the upper administration (thorough Dick Bowers and a committee) about a wellness program for faculty and staff. (If there is no mandate, the program will not be implemented.) I can tell you that our health care cost have risen in the past year, and wellness programs help to bring down costs. Since we're self-insured it is in our best interests to have a program.
- Work closely with HR to revise the Non-Compensation Conciliation Process. This is basically written, but need to get to the HR folks to see if there are major impediments already in the document. The VP's have rejected an earlier version (can't remember exactly when.) We began building the document last year in PWC, but we need to check it out before proceeding with further drafts. There may also need to be a look at the compensation conciliation process as we'll test that for the first time soon this year.
- Work closely with HR to create a rotation process for the Administrative Advisory Team (JAG Appeals.) We have a team and we've got more people to be on it however, we don't have an established procedure to let these gracious souls off the committee. This could be one of the earlier efforts by PWC (a two party sub committee who would make contact with a couple of long-term team members and HR (Becca or Donna), get background enough to devise a process for rotation. There is some information gathered already from a couple of team members that would be a good start.

That should be enough to begin the discussions. I don't know if any previous work exists about the caps issue. Sorry. Maybe Joe remembers.

Does this help?

Mary Beth

At 09:57 AM 9/22/2000 -0800, you wrote:

>Good Morning,

>

>I would like to receive the 'charge' for the Personnel Welfare Committee
>this year. Inge and I will review it and then set up a meeting with the
>whole committee to discuss and implement.

>If there are notes from last year that we also need for historical
>information, I'd appreciate receiving this too.

>



Bowling Green State University

Administrative Staff Council
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0573

May 31, 1995

Memorandum

To: Administrative Staff

From: Pat Green, Chair *Pat*

I wanted to take one last opportunity to bring you up to date on the various issues we have been working on this year and what will overlap with next year since my term of office will end on June 1. I also want to take the opportunity to thank all the members of Administrative Staff Council who have worked very hard this year on your behalf. Council members this year have spent a great amount of time working on ASC standing committees, University committees, interviewing presidential candidates, and still keeping very busy in professional activities.

- **Market Adjustments**

Staff who have requested a market survey should have received the results from Personnel by now. The results have also been forwarded to the appropriate vice presidents. Please note that Personnel does not make any recommendations to the vice presidents. Also, if a market survey indicates a great disparity between your salary and the market, there is no guarantee you will receive that amount. If you feel you are entitled to a market adjustment, discuss this with your supervisor who should then take your case forward to the vice president.

- **Position Analysis (Mercer Survey)**

A memo from the steering committee will be sent soon to all staff to fill in some details, answer some questions and provide a timeline. The steering committee has been very busy reviewing each position and raising questions when appropriate. Approximately 1/4 of the positions have been reviewed so far. As more information becomes available, staff will be informed. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact a member of the steering committee. The work of the steering committee will continue into next year through the appeals phase.

- **Recommendations for Handbook Changes**

There has been no action from the Administrative Council regarding the proposed changes to our handbook. Vice President Martin indicated that the changes dealing with clarification of salary issues would be taken care of as a result of the Mercer study. The proposed natal leave and change to the FMLA are being researched by Nancy Footer. ASC Executive Committee has indicated to Vice President Martin that we would like, if possible, for the natal leave and FMLA changes to be acted on by Ad Council soon so the changes could go forward to the Board of Trustees at the June meeting. Realistically with the change in presidency and preparation for a transition period, Ad Council may not get to our changes now. The new Executive Committee will continue to follow through on this.

- **Salary Recommendation**

I was invited to speak to the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the University Budget Committee about our recommendations. I shared with them several of the comments that were brought forth at the last ASC meeting which were representative of many staff members. This was a good opportunity to express some of our ideas about how merit is distributed, amount of across the board increase, and that all available money should be used for salary increases. There has been no action yet on the new budget.

- **Standard Performance Evaluation**

The committee established to create a standard performance evaluation tool has decided to wait until September to proceed. The committee would like to have an opportunity to present the concept to Dr. Ribeau for his input.

- **ASC Scholarship Corpus**

The goal this past year was to raise the ASC corpus to \$35,000. The actual amount is \$34,141.20. Thank you to all staff who have contributed to this very worthwhile effort. We are so close to our goal, it would be great to reach it this summer, so we can target a new goal for next year. It is never too late to contribute! Please send any contributions to Carl Peschel and indicate ASC scholarship fund.

- **Requests from Dr. Ribeau**

ASC has received several requests from Dr. Ribeau. He has requested suggestions for the theme, kinds of things people want to hear and issues addressed at Opening Day. ASC executive committee will brainstorm this at a special meeting. Also, Dr. Ribeau has requested the names of administrative staff members to serve on the search committee for a new Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Executive Committee will make suggestions. We are all very pleased to be included and look forward to future administrative staff involvement.

This past year has been a great experience for me. I have really enjoyed being chair of ASC and representing so many talented and diverse staff members. I had many opportunities to meet new staff and to become more acquainted with others. I want to thank those of you who have provided support and encouragement. I have had many "interesting encounters" and some challenges as well.

Thanks to all of you and good luck in your future endeavors!!

PG:aaf

Mary Zachary
Head, Access Services
Library

Summary of PWC Activities for 1999-2000

PWC was charged with three significant activities for the year. The first was to write a resolution that would facilitate the distribution of \$160K as outlined in the Administrative Compensation Plan of the 1998-1999 year. There was a need to determine the criteria by which staff members could be brought up to the midpoint. The second was to develop a resolution recommending implementation of Phase I of the Employee Wellness Program during the 2000-2001 fiscal year. The third, and unfinished, activity was to fix the Non-Compensation Conciliation Process that had been approved in May, 1998.

For the \$160K distribution, PWC needed to choose which of three criteria should be used for the 9 year period that staff would need to meet in order to be brought up to the midpoint. One could be just the number of years in position; a second could be number of years as an Administrative employee; and the third could be total years at the University. There were strong reasons why PWC endorsed the second criterion; however, this criterion was not endorsed as the final method of distributing the \$160K. Therefore, by default, PWC supported the decision that only number of years in position should determine the issue. Accordingly, PWC was represented in the HR process both for constructing and executing the Appeals Process that would accompany the \$160K distribution.

PWC developed a resolution for the implementation of Phase I of the Employee Wellness Program during the 2000-2001 fiscal year. Such resolution was passed by ASC on January 6, 2000.

One member of the administrative staff worked through the conciliation process and found it lacking in support for the employee. He petitioned ASC to rewrite the Conciliation Process for Non-Compensation Plan Complaints. HR indicated at the outset that they would not have time to consider the change until July 2000 at the earliest. Accordingly, PWC can hand over the document to next year's ASC Exec Team as a carryover issue for the new PWC. It is hoped that a September and October reading may establish the new document. This can only happen, though, if HR is involved with the process throughout the summer. We understand that Human Resources' approval is needed in order to facilitate change in this document.

Joe Luthman, 02:38 PM 5/5/2000, PWC meeting Tuesday 11am, HC C

X-Sender: jluthma@popj.bgsu.edu
 X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1
 Date: Fri, 05 May 2000 14:38:15 -0400
 To: jluthma@bgsu.edu, mcrow@bgsu.edu, fitzpatrick@wbgu.bgsu.edu,
 mcgiles@bgsu.edu, jkaplan@bgsu.edu, slagro@bgsu.edu,
 asavier@bgsu.edu, lopez@wbgu.bgsu.edu, mzachar@bgsu.edu
 From: Joe Luthman <jluthma@bgsu.edu>
 Subject: PWC meeting Tuesday 11am, HC Conf
 X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on MAIL03/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16,
 1999) at
 05/05/2000 02:34:26 PM,
 Serialize by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
 05/05/2000 02:38:57 PM,
 Serialize complete at 05/05/2000 02:38:57 PM

5/9, Tuesday 11am we'll meet at the Health Center Conference Room. Sandy will chair the meeting as I'll be taking one week of vacation.

There's been some hope expressed by several staff members that PWC could circulate a draft to all ASC reps during this month. This would constitute a 'first reading'. Then the second reading at the ASC meeting in June could culminate in a vote that would send it on to HR for action beginning July 1.

If there's any way we could get a draft ready for ASC exec meeting on 5/16, I think that would give all reps a chance to talk it over with their constituents.

The staff who are hoping for an accord before October, are feeling that until such an agreement is reached, there is no point in pursuing their cause. The current conciliation policy isn't conciliatory.

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Joe Luthman | |
| DBA | Information Technology Services |
| Phone: (419)372-7750 | 260 Hayes Hall |
| FAX: (419)372-7723 | Bowling Green State University |
| E-Mail: jluthma@bgsu.edu | Bowling Green, OH 43403 |



Joe Luthman, 07:59 PM 3/2/2000, PWC minutes from 2/29/2000

Bowling Green State University

William T. Jerome Library
Librarian and Learning Resources
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

From: jluthma@popj.bgsu.edu
To: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Thu, 02 Mar 2000 19:59:26 -0500
To: jluthma@bgsu.edu, mcrow@bgsu.edu, fitzpatrick@bgsu.edu,
mcgill@bgsu.edu, jkaplan@bgsu.edu, rslnopf@bgsu.edu,
slagro@bgsu.edu, asavier@bgsu.edu, lopez@bgsu.edu,
mzachar@bgsu.edu
From: Joe Luthman <jluthma@bgsu.edu>
Subject: PWC minutes from 2/29/2000
X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on MAIL03/SEFVEP/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
03/02/2000 07:46:58 PM,
Serialize by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SEFVEP/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
03/03/2000 09:03:16 AM,
Serialize complete at 03/03/2000 09:03:16 AM

Date of meeting: 2/29/2000
Members present: Joe Luthman, Josh Kaplan, Mike Fitzpatrick, Peg Crow, Mike Giles.
Issues discussed: Bonus pay, Proposed Change to Handbook regarding vacation pay and grant-funded positions.

BONUS PAY.

The question of bonus pay endorsement was discussed. The committee summarized the issue in this fashion.

ARGUMENT FOR:

This year is the first year that capped employees will receive no salary increase, unless the pay grades are increased beyond their present salary level. Bonus pay could help provide incentive for meritorious capped employees to continue their good work. Too, if bonus pay were extended to all Administrative Staff, exceptionally good performance could be immediately rewarded.

ARGUMENT AGAINST:

There are two avenues available to capped employees for enabling salary increases. One is to be classified as market exempt. The other is to have the position reevaluated for a higher pay grade.

One could argue that failure to qualify for market exemption or for a higher grade does make a statement that the existing pay is already above market levels. Bonus pay is illogical for these cases.

The awarding of bonus pay could deter a capped employee from seeking the more proper avenues already mentioned. Where capped employees are near the end of their working careers, failure to seek reevaluation or market exemption forces the next employee in that position to fight the unfought battle. It is best for all administrative staff to have inappropriately evaluated positions to be correctly addressed.

Were bonus pay to be significant, monies would probably be subtracted from permanent salary increases.

Prescribing the administration of bonus pay would detract from the current year's task of defining super merit pay. The latter must be prioritized, as it affects permanent salary increases.

MOTION FOR BONUS PAY:

The following motion was made, and seconded.

A relatively small pool of money should be set aside for bonus pay for capped employees.

After some discussion containing the points above, a vote of 5-0 against the motion, was recorded.

The committee felt strongly that the appropriate course of action for all capped employees was to seek market exemption, or reclassification.

PROPOSAL to AMEND the HANDBOOK

Unless explicitly prohibited by the grantor of a grant, and with the permission of their supervisor, grant-funded administrative staff positions on terminal contracts of twelve months or less may use their accrued vacation time before completing twelve months of

service.

However, PWC felt it would be even better to amend the handbook so that either

- 1) administrative staff would need to wait only six months before using accrued vacation time; or
- 2) administrative staff could use vacation time as accrued, so long as their supervisor approved.

PWC felt that obtaining VP approval for all early vacation time simply annoys the vice presidents for no good business reason. In practice, such requests are rarely refused. Worse, it sets up the regrettable possibility that a supervisor could refuse the vacation request, and be overridden by a vice president. Immediate supervisors should be delegated the authority to okay all vacation requests, even those that occur in the first twelve months of service to the university.

MARY Beth

final draft₉

to be sent to
EXEC
at end
of day

(First draft of PWC meeting minutes.)

Date of meeting: 2/29/2000

Members present: Joe Luthman, Josh Kaplan, Mike Fitzpatrick, Peg Crow, Mike Giles.

Issues discussed: Bonus pay, Proposed Change to Handbook regarding vacation pay and grant-funded positions

BONUS PAY.

The question of bonus pay endorsement was discussed. The committee summarized the issue in this fashion.

ARGUMENT FOR:

This year is the first year that capped employees will receive no salary increase, unless the pay grades are increased beyond their present salary level. Bonus pay could help provide incentive for meritorious capped employees to continue their good work. Too, if bonus pay were extended to all Administrative Staff, exceptionally good performance could be immediately rewarded.

ARGUMENT AGAINST:

There are two avenues available to capped employees for enabling salary increases. One is to be classified as market exempt. The other is to have the position reevaluated for a higher pay grade.

One could argue that failure to qualify for market exemption or for a higher grade does make a statement that the existing pay is already above market levels. Bonus pay is illogical for these cases.

The awarding of bonus pay could deter a capped employee from seeking the more proper avenues already mentioned. Where capped employees are near the end of their working careers, failure to seek reevaluation or market exemption forces the next employee in that position to fight the same battle. It is best for all administrative staff to have inappropriately evaluated positions to be correctly addressed.

Were bonus pay to be significant, monies would probably be subtracted from permanent salary increases.

Prescribing the administration of bonus pay would detract from the current year's task of defining super meritorious pay. The latter must be prioritized, as it affects permanent salary increases.

MOTION FOR BONUS PAY:

The following motion was made, and seconded.

A relatively small pool of money should be set aside for bonus pay for capped employees.

After some discussion containing the points above, a vote of 5-0 against the motion, was recorded.

The committee felt strongly that the appropriate course of action for all capped employees was to seek market exemption, or reclassification.

PROPOSAL to AMEND the HANDBOOK

Unless explicitly prohibited by the grantor of a grant, and with the permission of their supervisor, grant-funded administrative staff positions on terminal contracts of twelve months or less may use their accrued vacation time before completing twelve months of service.

However, PWC felt it would be even better to amend the handbook so that either

1) administrative staff would need to wait only six months before using accrued vacation time; or

2) administrative staff could use vacation time as accrued, so long as their supervisor approved.

Joe Luthman, 10:38 PM 3/1/00 -, PWC notes

PWC felt that obtaining VP approval for all early vacation time simply annoys the vice presidents for no good business reason. In practice, such requests are rarely refused. Worse, it sets up the regrettable possibility that a supervisor could refuse the vacation request, and be overridden by a vice president. Immediate supervisors should be delegated the authority to okay all vacation requests, even those that occur in the first twelve months of service to the university.

Joe Luthman, 10:49 AM 2/28/2000, FWC mtg Tues 11am

X-Sender: jluthma@popj.bgsu.edu
 X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
 Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2000 10:49:44 -0500
 To: jluthma@bgnnet.bgsu.edu, mcrow@bgnnet.bgsu.edu, fitzpatrick@wbgu.bgsu.edu,
 mcgiles@bgnnet.bgsu.edu, jkaplan@bgnnet.bgsu.edu, rsknopf@bgnnet.bgsu.edu,
 slagro@bgnnet.bgsu.edu, asavier@bgnnet.bgsu.edu, loper@wbgu.bgsu.edu,
 mzachar@bgnnet.bgsu.edu
 From: Joe Luthman <jluthma@bgnnet.bgsu.edu>
 Subject: PWC mtg Tues 11am
 X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on MAIL03/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16,
 1999) at
 02/28/2000 10:37:27 AM,
 Serialize by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
 02/28/2000 10:52:04 AM,
 Serialize complete at 02/28/2000 10:52:04 AM

Folks,

Just a reminder about the PWC meeting tomorrow at 11am. We'll continue discussion about bonus pay. I can resend the notes from our last discussion, should any desire.

The President's address begins at 10am tomorrow. Would this affect anyone?

Here are minutes from last meeting.

PWC report

1) We passed along minor handbook changes to Bev Stearns, and noted some changes we'd like to see for the next version.

a) Information on ARP (Alternative Retirement Program)

b) Add PERS retirement benefits chart. This is the % of best 3 year average that accompanies x years service. Also how many years one needs before the ability to retire.

Both these could be added to the online version. Which also suggests that amending the online version may need an approval process that is both different and/or more prompt than the paper version. As with all online documents, determining the official handbook copy may get ambiguous quite soon.

c) Specify vacation allowances for grant-funded employees. There are discrepancies between these employees as to whether they get ANY vacation.

2) \$160,000 salary enhancement.

Many voiced their concerns over the use of the 'years in position' criterion. Years as an admin staff employee would be a better criterion.

3) Bonus pay.

We must discuss this next Tuesday. Handbook discussion consumed 1hr 15 minutes.

4) Meeting time change.

11am on Tuesdays that EXEC does not meet. Place is still in H/Ctr Conference Room.

Joe Luthman

DBA

Phone: (419)372-7750

FAX: (419)372-7723

E-Mail: jluthma@bgnnet.bgsu.edu

Information Technology Services

260 Hayes Hall

Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, OH 43403

Joe Luthman, 09:14 AM 2/3/2000, 2/1 PWC meeting summary

X-Sender: jluthma@popj.bgsu.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 09:14:40 -0500
To: jluthma@bgsu.bgsu.edu, mcrow@bgsu.bgsu.edu, fitzpatrick@wbgu.bgsu.edu,
mcgiles@bgsu.bgsu.edu, jkaplan@bgsu.bgsu.edu, rsknopf@bgsu.bgsu.edu,
slagro@bgsu.bgsu.edu, asavier@bgsu.bgsu.edu, lopez@wbgu.bgsu.edu,
mzachar@bgsu.bgsu.edu
From: Joe Luthman <jluthma@bgsu.bgsu.edu>
Subject: 2/1 PWC meeting summary
X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on MAIL03/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
02/03/2000 09:03:40 AM,
Serialize by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
02/03/2000 09:15:50 AM,
Serialize complete at 02/03/2000 09:15:50 AM

SUBJECT: Summary of Bonus Pay discussion during PWC meeting of 2/1/2000
Members present: Josh Kaplan, Anne Saviers, Mike Fitzpatrick, Joe Luthman

Please send back comments and/or editing of this summary of the discussion we had during the PWC meeting on Tuesday 2/1/2000. I've kept the summary as succinct as possible. Where it's not understood, pls indicate.

WHAT: We'll need to either endorse the concept of bonus pay or not. If we endorse, we move forward to describe its use and allocation of funds. If we do not, we defend why and suggest better avenues for additional compensation funds.

Argument for.

- 1) Incentive for exceptional performance. Extremely meritorious employees could gain additional one-time bonus pay.
- 2) This may be the only way that capped employees can earn additional pay.

Argument against.

- 1) Salary pool for merit pay increases may be negatively affected.
- 2) The bonus pay issue may divert attention away from the definition of super merit.

Workarounds, ways to avoid the need for bonus pay.

Capped employees can escape the no-raise dilemma if their managers can make them market exempt (is this the correct term?)... Market evaluations for all capped employees should be performed. If market exemption is warranted, then this is the proper approach. If not, then bonus pay should not be used to continue augmenting a salary that is already inordinately high. (aside - this may or may not be my opinion. But I find it more helpful in these discussions to use direct statements. If these statements provoke no controversy, then there may be a strong sentiment that they are commonly accepted)

The activities for which bonus pay should be used.

- 1) Long standing work improvements.
- 2) One-time money saving business process change.

How bonus pay should be administered.

BOT should administer different dollar amounts to the vice presidents in accordance with how their unit fared in the last year. VP's should administer these dollars to their staff (excluding themselves).

Justification: Allocating equal funds to all VP's based on how many employees are in their unit would simply be another 'across the board' type of increase. If real bonus pay is desired, then it follows that some win, some don't.

SUBJECT 2: Meeting time change.

Our schedules often change between semesters, especially for contract staff who teach. Mike Giles would very much like to continue participating with PWC but is teaching a class on Tuesdays during our scheduled meetings. If it's not too difficult to find another

Joe Luthman, 09:14 AM 2/3/2000, 2/1 FWC meeting summary

meeting time, let's give it a try. Accordingly, please list the times of the week when you CANNOT meet.

Ex. Every other Thursday 10:30 to 12

 Last Friday of months from 10 to 12

If it's easier to list times of the week when you CAN meet, feel free to use this approach.

Please use whichever method saves you time.

Claudia Clark, 12:07 PM 2/24/2000, Re: ASC Minutes - Salary

X-Sender: caclark.bgsu@popc.bgsu.edu
 Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2000 12:07:55 -0500
 To: "John M. Clark" <jclark2@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
 From: Claudia Clark <caclark@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
 Subject: Re: ASC Minutes - Salary
 Cc: lopez@wbgu.bgsu.edu, mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu
 X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on MAIL01/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
 02/24/2000 12:04:08 PM,
 Serialize by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
 02/24/2000 12:08:10 PM,
 Serialize complete at 02/24/2000 12:08:10 PM

John--near as I can figure, your recourse is as follows: at some appropriate time at the next meeting (possibly when the time comes to vote on the January minutes or under during old business) ask for the floor and then say:

"I move to reconsider the vote on the approval of the December minutes"
 The chair will ask for a second and then a vote. Majority rules.
 Then the chair will ask for discussion at which point you will present the amended language that you are requesting.
 The group will then be invited to discuss your request, then the December minutes will again be voted on, this time "as amended".
 Claudia

John--I will need to research this in Roberts rules. Will do so as time permits.
 Claudia

>Jodi:

>
 >You point out a mistake in punctuation that I didn't catch--what we in
 >English call an "unclear referent." What's (we hope) being taken to Dean's
 >Council is the previously mentioned item--"overload" compensation for Ad
 >Staff teaching. The reference is indeed very muddy--I should have taken it
 >up with Claudia Clark, who takes the minutes--and UNIV stipends have
 >nothing to do with our intention to approach Dean's Council. Your stipends
 >are entirely another matter--related to Ad Staff teaching only
 >tangentially. If it's not too late for a change, I'll offer Claudia a way
 >to revise these statements for greater clarity. What the minutes _should_
 >have said is something like... "although UNIV 100 is now offering
 >stipends--and the issue of Ad Staff teaching compensation is being taken to
 >the Dean's Council."

>
 >
 >Apologies,
 >John Clark

>>Hi John -

>>
 >>I was reviewing the ASC minutes and was wondering if you could clarify a
 >>statement in the Salary committee report related to the UNIV 100 stipend we
 >>are now awarding to our instructors. "He also reported that there are
 >>programs such as UNIV 100 that have typically relied on volunteers,
 >>although UNIV 100 is now offering stipends and that the issue is being
 >>taken to the Dean's Council" I am wondering about the reference to Dean's
 >>Council - what does that mean? We are all "official" with awarding our
 >>stipend and I am wondering who is taking this to Dean's Council?

>>
 >>Thanks -
 >>Jodi Webb

>>
 >>Salary: John Clark reported that the committee is continuing to meet with
 >>Rebecca Ferguson and has clarified a few more issues about the teaching
 >>compensation issue (e.g., exactly how much teaching is being done by
 >>Administrative Staff). He also stated that compensation has usually been
 >>at the faculty overload rate of \$500.00 per credit hour (less than the rate
 >>for part-time faculty), but the committee is uncertain as to whether this
 >>rate is mandated by the charter. The committee will be looking into this

>>matter. He also reported that there are programs such as UNIV 100 that
>>have typically relied on volunteers, although UNIV 100 is now offering
>>stipends and that the issue is being taken to the Dean's Council. Lopez
>>then suggested to John Clark that the Salary Committee might be interested
>>in working with the Personnel Welfare Committee on a plan to reward
>>meritorious Administrative Staff who have reached the cap of their grade
>>level's salary range.
>>
>>Jodi Webb, Director
>>First Year Experience Program
>>Bowling Green State University
>>406 Moseley Hall
>>Bowling Green, OH 43403
>>(419)372-9348 phone
>>(419)372-9686 fax
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>Dr. John Clark
>General Studies Writing
>Bowling Green University
>Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Claudia Clark, 09:14 AM 1/28/200, January 6 minutes draft

Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2000 09:14:30 -0500
 Reply-To: asc-reps@listproc.bgsu.edu
 Sender: owner-asc-reps@listproc.bgsu.edu
 From: Claudia Clark <caclark@bgnnet.bgsu.edu>
 To: ASC-REPS <asc-reps@listproc.bgsu.edu>
 Subject: January 6 minutes draft
 X-To: ASC-REPS@listproc.bgsu.edu
 X-Cc: ldobb@bgnnet.bgsu.edu, fergusb@bgnnet.bgsu.edu
 X-Sender: caclark.bgsu@popc.bgsu.edu
 X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on MAILGW02/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
 01/28/2000 09:10:49 AM,
 Serialize by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
 01/31/2000 08:08:48 AM,
 Serialize complete at 01/31/2000 08:08:48 AM

Dear colleagues: Please review the following draft and submit additions or corrections by next Tuesday if possible. Many thanks--Claudia

Minutes of Administrative Staff Council Meeting
 January 6, 2000

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:35 by Chair, Paul Lopez

Members Present: William Blair, Pat Booth, Deb Boyce, Sidney Childs, Claudia Clark, John Clark, Michael C. Giles, Jr., Kay Gudehus, Linda Hamilton, John Hartung, Keith Hofacker, Tony Howard, Sandy LaGro, Thad Long, Paul Lopez, Joe Luthman, Pamela Phillips, Cheryl Purefoy, Jane Schimpf, Mary Beth Zachary

Guest/s: Scott Borgelt- Monitor, Linda Dobb-Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Rebecca Ferguson-Assistant Provost, Human Resources

Members who sent substitutes: Suzanne Fahrner for Laura Emch, Sue Zwayer for Mary Lynn Pozniak, Jeff Grilliott for Anne Saviers, Ann Bowers for Diane Smith, Gene Palmer for Laura Waggoner, Diane Pagan for Matt Webb

Absent: Linda Bakhum, Marilyn Braatz, Nancy Coy, Ron Knopf, Sr., Jane B. Myers, Penny Nemitz, Nancy Vanderlugt

Approval of Minutes: Cheryl Purefoy moved, Jane Schimpf seconded, and the minutes were approved as distributed.

Guest Speakers: Linda Dobb and Rebecca Ferguson facilitated a discussion about the current situation regarding the distribution of the \$160,000 called for in President Ribeiro's Compensation Plan as it pertains to Administrative Staff. Ferguson initiated the discussion by reporting that Human Resources is continuing to look at the data regarding where people are in the salary range at their grade level and their years of experience. She also indicated that a large number of Administrative Staff with nine or more years of experience were still below the first quartile of their range. She stated that the Compensation Committee is close to making a decision about this year's distribution. Dobb stated that she and Ferguson would be meeting with the Compensation Committee tomorrow to make some recommendations that would need to be examined by the University attorney prior to being implemented and that she and Ferguson were not at liberty to disclose the recommendations until this had occurred. Dobb also said that the intent of the first cut of data was to bring those with nine or more years of experience to the midpoint. She further asserted that she was convinced that the plan would now go forward, although it was not expected to perfectly address the needs of all concerned. Ferguson then said that there had been promises made to people with five or more years of experience and that there was a commitment to honoring these promises.

The ensuing discussion resulted in the following conclusions:

Claudia Clark, 09:14 AM 1/28/2000, January 6 minutes draft

- (1.) that decisions will be made on the basis of years of experience, not years at the university per se (Dobb)
- (2.) that the approval by the University attorney and review by the Department of Labor is expected to take until about the end of January (Dobb)
- (3.) that when a person's salary was last adjusted and the impact of the \$662.00 market adjustment earlier this year will be factors in decision-making about distribution (Ferguson)
- (4.) that market exceptions may need to be made to address the salaries of those in departments or areas that are special recruitment challenges such as information technology (Ferguson)
- (5.) that ASC needs to acknowledge that the current administration is attempting to do what is right in the absence of external motivators and that it will not be possible to please everyone (Luthman)
- (6.) that it has always been the intent to address those with five to nine years of experience as of June 30, 1999 but that the funds available for this fiscal year will only be sufficient to address those with 9+ years (Dobb)
- (7.) that there are no commitments being made beyond those stated by Dobb and Ferguson in their opening remarks and that, in the future, years of experience will not be a criterion for adjustments because it is not a criterion in a market-driven system (Ferguson)
- (8.) that market data is not available for all positions, but that Human Resources is working on other ways of getting data (e.g., creating salary surveys, asking CUPA to add categories, identifying other databases) and, in fact, routinely asks employees to get data if they believe they are dealing with a salary compression issue (Dobb and Ferguson)
- (9.) that there may be a time when it will be helpful for ASC to develop a resolution regarding the Compensation Plan, but it is not necessary at the present time (Dobb and Ferguson)
- (10.) that there are still many questions to be addressed and that administration is open to doing so (e.g., how do we stay competitive in the market, what works to reward and motivate, are there compensations other than salaries that can do so, etc.) (Ferguson)
- (11.) that it is unlikely that we will ever develop a system in which an employee can expect to be at first quartile by year x of employment and at midpoint by year y of employment (Luthman reframing comments by Ferguson)
- (12.) that Human Resources will continue to address compensation issues at the unit level when possible (Ferguson)
- (13.) that Human Resources is in the processing of hiring to fill a permanent position in which the person will report to Donna Wittwer and will deal only with compensation issues. This person will work toward building a database "for all time" (Ferguson)
- (14.) that Human Resources will also have a "manager of employee relations" beginning July 1, 2000. An existing position will be restructured and the person in the position will be responsible for dealing with complaints, disciplinary procedures for classified staff, and training departments on how to hire

Chair Report:

Paul Lopez reported that the Provost candidate sessions with Administrative and Classified staff finished up on December 10th. He thanked Mary Lynn Pozniak and the External Affairs committee for their good job of making sure that Administrative Staff had good representation at all of the sessions.

He also reported that the leadership team (Lopez, Zachary, and Clark) represented Administrative Staff at the following meetings:

(1.) Board of Trustees meeting on (12/6). Primary business affecting Administrative Staff was the passing of the changes in the fee waiver benefit outlined in the handout that was distributed. At the Academic and Student Affairs committee meeting, Lopez learned of the change in University policy to inform parents of students' underage drinking (2nd offense). Jill Carr is the contact for specific details. Lopez also learned of the "Peer-based misperception programming" Terry Pentner of the Journalism department is doing to address the alcohol problem on our campus. Lopez expressed his opinion that ASC as a group should do something to support the efforts to combat binge drinking

Claudia Clark, 09:14 AM 1/28/200, January 6 minutes draft

on the BGSU campus. He suggested the following options and invited feedback and additional ideas from others: 1) contact the appropriate group on campus (Wellness Connection) and see if a resolution from ASC would help them in their efforts, 2) ask how ASC could further the education with student employees in our areas through out the University. 3) volunteer to help with the February 25th "Big Playground" event designed to promote fun without alcohol.

(2.) Lunch scheduled with Eileen Sullivan & Interim Provost Dobb (12/9), but not attended by Sullivan. The following information and questions were shared with Dobb:

- Lopez's understanding of the timetable for the communication of what will happen in this upcoming second year of the Compensation Plan. Confirmed that late February to March was the time President Ribeau said he would have the figures he needed to make this communication.
- Lopez asked whether or not a communication from President Ribeau would be appropriate in motivating those that have not yet submitted Merit documents. Dobb replied that the main areas that needed to report were academic and that she would be handling this.
- Lopez also requested that Dobb to give copies of the ASC draft resolution and the historical paperwork on a comprehensive Wellness Plan to Eileen Sullivan in the hopes of getting feedback from Ribeau about the plan.

(3.) Breakfast meeting with the Director of Human Resources Rebecca Ferguson (12/14).

-Lopez sought input on the Wellness resolution proposal to let her know it was coming to a vote at today's meeting. He also asked if there were anything ASC could do to help make this year's compensation distribution happen. Ferguson suggested taking it up with Sullivan and Ribeau.

(4.) ASC Executive Committee met 12/14 and was invited to a combined session with PWC on 12/21. Primary discussions were on the two PWC resolutions, Wellness and Compensation. The Wellness resolution is being presented today. The Compensation resolution is to be reviewed by the Executive Committee next Tuesday (1/11). A Parking committee representative was asked to attend the 12/14 meeting but was unable to do so. They will, however, attend the 1/11 Executive Committee meeting.

Chair-Elect Report: Mary Beth Zachary reported on the current financial situation of ASC. She stated that ASC started the fiscal year with \$2,586 and that there is currently a \$1,713.88 balance. It is anticipated that this will be sufficient to meet ASC's needs for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Zachary also reminded those assembled that ASC elections would begin soon. She encouraged everyone to think seriously about running for office for next year. She also stated that she intended to continue using the present model of a leadership team during her tenure as chair.

Secretary's Report: none

Committee Reports:

Amendments: no report

External Affairs: no report

Awards and Special Recognition: Tony Howard reported that a mailing would be going out seeking nominations for the BG Best Awards. He also said that the committee was finishing up their plan to institute a "Spirit of BG" award which would include a gift of flowers in a hand-blown vase. Howard also indicated that Laura Waggoner would be speaking with someone about putting the new Ferrari award on a kiosk instead of a plaque in the Student Union when it reopens. Waggoner is reportedly investigating the possibility that the Union might pay for it.

Claudia Clark, 09:14 AM 1/28/200, January 6 minutes draft

Internal Affairs: Linda Hamilton reported that the ASC website would be finalized next week.

Personnel Welfare: no report

Professional Development: Laura Emch reported that the next meeting of the committee will be next Tuesday. The business to be addressed at this meeting will include choosing the topics for the ASC conference which will be organized around the Core Values. Kay Gudehus invited those assembled to let the committee know of any possible topics of interest. Emch also reported that decisions about professional development grants will be made at these meeting. Lopez advised that the committee keep track of the number of applications with a view towards possibly getting additional funding for this in the future.

Salary: John Clark reported that the committee is continuing to meet with Rebecca Ferguson and has clarified a few more issues about the teaching compensation issue (e.g., exactly how much teaching is being done by Administrative Staff). He also stated that compensation has usually been at the faculty overload rate of \$500.00 per credit hour (less than the rate for part-time faculty), but the committee is uncertain as to whether this rate is mandated by the charter. The committee will be looking into this matter. He also reported that there are programs such as UNIV 100 that have typically relied on volunteers, although UNIV 100 is now offering stipends and that the issue is being taken to the Dean's Council. Lopez then suggested to John Clark that the Salary Committee might be interested in working with the Personnel Welfare Committee on a plan to reward meritorious Administrative Staff who have reached the cap of their grade level's salary range.

Scholarship: Cheryl Purefoy reported that a letter is being sent out as announced in the e-mail she sent to the listproc earlier this week regarding the scholarship raffle.

Ad Hoc Committee on Handbook Revision: Mary Beth Zachary reported that a draft of the handbook is expected to be ready for the Executive Committee to look at in the next two weeks, but the final version will probably not be ready for the March Board of Trustees meeting.

Old Business: Sandy LaGro discussed issues related to the Compensation Plan including the issue of what the Personnel Welfare Committee's role could be vis a vis the plan given the information shared by today's guest speakers. Lopez indicated that it might be appropriate to draft a resolution to inform administration of ASC's preferences regarding the distribution of available funds. LaGro then presented the resolution calling for a comprehensive Employee Wellness Plan for the consideration of those assembled. There was no discussion. Keith Hofacker moved, Michael Giles seconded and the resolution was passed as distributed.

New Business: none

Good of the Order: Mary Beth Zachary reported that the library now has copies of Microsoft software available for staff to borrow to install on their work and home computers. These include Office 98 and Front Page for Macintosh, and Windows 98 and 95, Visual Studio Probe, and Office 2000 for PC's. All of these programs are on CD-ROM. Technical questions related to installation or use of these programs should be directed to ITS. Cheryl Purefoy reported that the Copy Center in University Hall will be open starting Monday January 10. Kay Gudehus reported that the information regarding President's Day was distributed with the incorrect date. The correct date is Monday February 21. A correction letter will be going out.

Michael Giles moved and Jane Schimpf seconded to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Claudia Clark, 09:14 AM 1/28/200, January 6 minutes draft

Respectfully submitted,
Claudia A. Clark
Secretary

Becca Meeting

1/11/2000

PWC Resolution on Wellness...distribution to Eileen/President

What can you share about the meeting on Friday regarding distribution of the \$160,000?

What about appeals to years in position determinations?

We've tasked Salary and PWC to look at how we can advise a fair and consistent treatment (with regards to pay) to those who find themselves at their salary caps this year. Would you want us to work with someone in your office?

Time in position
Range - 3 yrs - looking -
7-9 yrs - 1st
must for individual

Non renewals

freeze ranges

Salary adjustment
no in position will not
be an ongoing criteria

Beneish Stearns
Sent Becca

→ 2 mark.com
→ 12 in athletics
→ 1000 minutes

Parking -

Dean's giving Reserved spaces.

won't necessarily reduce # of reserved spots.

Categories: NOTHING BEYOND WHAT IS ON PAPER. Specific criteria for siting.

5 in the charge of...

- Position Geo level.

Dean's!

Academic Needs?

- Event -

- Fund Raising

63 spots individual

49 dept vehicles

44 state vehicle

129 Rackings

Implementation

Anything that's there.

1 person loses one spot

All deans that want them have them.

Wagman Greyhound

Parking Com.

doesn't get these

Stacie - will make decision

3 & 4. parking Com. to the President

Police/Security

modifications

gist of what we're doing now

"on call" means on call.

Rebecca Ferguson, 09:58 AM 11/18/99, Re: PWC Issues, etc.

X-Sender: fergusb@popf.bgsu.edu (Unverified)
 X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)
 Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 09:58:29 -0600
 To: jluthma@bgnet.bgsu.edu, dwittwe@bgnet.bgsu.edu
 From: Rebecca Ferguson <fergusb@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
 Subject: Re: PWC Issues, etc.
 Cc: mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu, caclark@bgnet.bgsu.edu,
 Paul_G_Lopez@wbgu.bgsu.edu (Paul G. Lopez)
 X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on MAILGW01/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.1a|August 17, 1999)
 at
 11/18/99 09:53:14 AM,
 Serialize by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SERVER/BGSU(Release 5.0.1a|August 17, 1999) at
 11/18/99 03:33:36 PM,
 Serialize complete at 11/18/99 03:33:36 PM

Joe I am sorry I have not had time to return you phone call - wild week. I am going to leave getting you and Donna together to the two of you. Donna and I have talked about the requests (as Paul has articulated much better than I did). Donna knows if the two of you need my assistance to let me know.

Regarding you question on amount of time this will all take. Donna could give you a better idea and I think you will have a better notion after the two of you have met.

Thank you for being willing to help. There are just not enough of us over here with the necessary skills to get everything done PWC has requested due to the fact I have Donna focused in some very specific directions.

Joe both Donna and I have a high level of respect for your abilities and trust you, so thank you again!! Becca

At 02:05 PM 11/16/99 -0500, Paul G. Lopez wrote:

>Joe...
 >At this morning's meeting with Becca Ferguson, we requested information
 >that would give us a better picture on just who would be adversely
 >effected (not receive but maybe should receive and adjustment) by the
 >current "market adjustment" distribution plan (the Mid-point to Maximum
 >info for Admin staff). Becca felt Donna Witwer could not get this
 >information to us in the near future. We suggested it shouldn't be too
 >difficult to run this info out from their database and that Donna had
 >suggested in September this was data we would get. Becca assured us it
 >was not an easy thing. We suggested we could get someone to help Donna.
 >She said it would have to be someone Donna trusts. She suggested you and
 >that you give her a call. We're hoping you want to do this...
 >
 >In the meeting on 11/2 which I was unable to attend, Becca suggested PWC
 >could help HR with identifying AS positions that were not submitted to
 >CUPA and the Mid-level CUPA then making sure these identified positions
 >don't fit already submitted positions but just have different titles. I
 >sense the process of this exercise is to identify those positions HR will
 >need to do independent Market searches on for the 3rd year of the current
 >iteration of the compensation plan.
 >
 >Further, HR would like to hear from PWC regarding what Administrative
 >staff would like to see in incentive/bonus situations.
 >
 >Please consider the Becca request for your help with Donna and please pass
 >the other two items on to PWC.
 >
 >Becca is looking to get the Provost and herself to the December 2nd ASC
 >meeting to spell out the compensation "paradigm", answer questions, give
 >reasons for "why not", etc. No confirmation as yet.
 >
 >Paul
 >
 >Paul G. Lopez
 >Production Manager
 >Tucker Center for Telecommunications